UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

"Capacity to Pay"

By S. O. LEVINSON

What is the Self?

By ZONA GALE

Christian Leadership in American Government

By EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD

VOLUME XCVI NUMBER 10

Chicago, November 23, 1925

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
HENRY LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) .....

Address .....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIALS—
Notes 147
What Is the Self?—ZONA GALE 149
Jottings.—J. H. H. 150
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—REV. SYDNEY STRONG 151

ARTICLES—
A Great Man—*Herman Keyserling* 147
"Capacity to Pay."—S. O. LEVINSON 152
Christian Leadership in American Government. EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD 154
A Brief Study of a Subtle Mind. — REV. CHARLES F. DOLE 157

CORRESPONDENCE—
An Open Letter to the Governor of California. REV. ARTHUR B. HEEB 158
An Appeal.—W. CAMERON FORBES 159

THE FIELD—
An Important Announcement to Chicago Readers 159
International Fellowship of Reconciliation 159

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1925 NUMBER 10

A GREAT MAN

Any one who has ever met a great man has said to himself, "I always knew him." Of course he did. This, then, is the final explanation of the immense effect which the mere existence of such a man radiates. He shows men what every one could be, what all men are at bottom, in spirit and in truth. . . . This brings us to the root of the recognition that the mere existence of a saint is more beneficent than all the good actions of the world; this explains, moreover, the ultimate significance of a savior. He gives an example to mankind . . . and, in so doing, he renders the extremest service which one being can render to another."

—Hermann Keyserling, in The Travel Diary of a Philosopher.

Mr. S. O. Levinson, distinguished lawyer, eminent as the originator of the Outlawry of War program, writes with an authority on the question of European debts to this country which we ourselves cannot hope to command. His article, entitled "Capacity to Pay," published in this week's issue of UNITY, is therefore most welcome as a confirmation and endorsement of our views as stated in these columns some weeks ago. Mr. Levinson shows conclusively that America, so far from being a "Shylock" in this matter, is on the contrary an "easy mark." Belgium, France and now Italy under the guise of the specious doctrine of "capacity to pay," are putting over on us a practice which would not be tolerated for a single moment in private financing nor by the government in relation to its own debtors in this country. It's as clever a "scheme to defraud" as history can show. The repudiation involved is bad enough in itself, but it becomes a thousand times worse when its connection with the existing war system is uncovered. Take France, for example! Americans are asked to be merciful because of France's sufferings in the war. Shall we exact our "pound of flesh" from starving people and shattered homes? But worthy sentiment of this kind has nothing to do with the question. The French people, their sufferings and necessities, are in no way involved. Postponement of payments, payment in part, or entire cancellation, would help French citizens not a whit, but serve only to fill the government exchequer for wars in the Riff and in Syria, and for other imperialistic exploits. If France had given to the United States in payment of her just debts one-half of what she has spent in wars and preparations for wars during the last seven years, her problem would already be well advanced toward solution. All of which means that the whole "capacity to pay" movement is a conspiracy to jockey the United States into financing the new as well as the old debaucheries of the European war system. A thousand thanks to Mr. Levinson for making this so clear!

What the League of Nations did in the Greece-Bulgaria embroilment has been suitably commended in these columns. This was a real victory—the first achieved since the League's organization. But it was a victory of big powers over small powers—the case of a householder sweeping away from his door-step two fighting cats, which were disturbing the peace and order of the neighborhood. This is good, but hardly significant. Much more important is the League's action in calling upon France to give an account of its stewardship in Syria, or at least a report on recent proceedings there. Here is a full-sized war well under way. This war is bringing reports of horrors and atrocities comparable to anything ever charged against the Germans in Belgium. The nations involved are, on the one hand, one of the great powers sitting at the Council table of the League in Geneva, and, on the other hand, a people taken under the protection of the League as a ward or "mandate." France, in other words, is preying upon one of the League's own foster-children; the war is right inside the League's own jurisdiction. The trouble has been going on for a long time, and the inaction of the League has been one of the scandals of the time, a proof of the League's ineffectiveness in matters that really count. But now a climax has come! All Syria is flaming with revolt; Damascus has been wantonly bombarded and many of its oldest buildings destroyed or damaged; British and American citizens have been placed in peril. And the League calls upon France for an explanation! Here is a matter as much more significant than the Greece-Bulgarian affair as France is more important than those two Balkan states. If the League carries through and ends the war in Syria, it will have won its case. Its advocates may then chant loud and long, "We told you so!" But if the League stops short of drastic and final action, its end will have come. At last we are face to face with a test in which there can be no excuses or evasions on either side.

California puts her communists in jail. New York prints the names of their political candidates on her ballots, and invites their supporters to the voting booths under police protection. In California one would imagine that a Communist is some kind of wild beast not safe to have at large, or at least some dangerous kind of maniac seeking the overthrow of government and the destruction of the state. But in New York a Communist is regarded as a man and citizen, and allowed full liberty to talk and agitate, with the result that he seems to be as negligible a factor in society as he is

harmless. Patriotic societies and other aggregations of lunacy still talk about the "red" menace as though it were an army of locusts making ready to devour us. But New York lets the "reds" stand up and be counted, and when the figures are tabulated even Secretary of State Kellogg ought to be able to go to sleep without looking under the bed. For example, in the recent mayoralty election in New York City, over one million and one hundred thousand (1,100,000) votes were cast. In this avalanche of Republican and Democratic ballots, the Socialists, who are more disorganized than they have been at any time since the war, polled in round numbers 45,000 votes. The Workers Party, the "red" group, on the other hand, rolled up a total of only 3388. In all this vast city of between five and six million people, there were less than 4000 men and women who are affiliated with the Communist organization. Or, if we double this amount, and then add some more, to cover the Communists who refuse or disdain to vote on principle, and the enthusiastic "red" youth who are too young to vote, we have a total of less than 10,000. And this is the crowd that is going to corrupt the army and navy, invade and capture the labor unions, blow up Wall Street, and overthrow the government in Washington! We are certain that our Communist brethren never feel so little discouraged, so hugely confident of their ability to bring off "the revolution," as when they note the terror of their enemies. If ten thousand "reds" can create such a panic, what may not a hundred thousand do?

Our friend, Dr. Libby, of the National Council for the Prevention of War, is a reader of the *Army and Navy Register*. This is a duty imposed upon him in punishment for his sins as a pacifist, and it must be like the cross of Calvary! But such crucifixion is not without avail. Thus in reading the September 19th issue of this journal, Dr. Libby has discovered the text of a bill, drafted by the General Staff of the War Department, to be introduced into the next Congress to strengthen the National Defense Act of 1920. The provisions of the proposed bill are interesting. First, all male persons between the ages of 18 and 45 (inclusive) shall be "subject to registration in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President. . . . All persons registered shall be and remain subject to draft into the public armed forces of the United States." Secondly, local and district draft boards, "and the necessary additional advisory agencies," shall be set up and maintained. Lastly, "any or all Departments and any or all officers or agents of the United States and of the several states, territories and District of Columbia, and sub-divisions thereof," may be utilized in the execution of this Act. What this means is obvious. Every boy, on attaining the age of 18, would have to register with the War Department or go to prison. "He must accept the yoke," says Dr. Libby. The draft boards, set up in every village and hamlet of the land, would act as a police service, or "cheka," to report upon all young men in their respective communities and bring them to heel. Finally, the whole machinery of government in this country, national, state and local, would be put at the free disposal of the War Department for this military enslavement of the people. The *Army and Navy Register* states that "an earnest effort to pass the law will be made." Undoubtedly! And the effort will not be without some measure of success—the majority of the men in Congress are well over 45 years of age. But that the bill will actually be passed into law is not at all likely. Still, it is highly advisable that the peace forces of the country oppose the bill with a vigor at least commensurate with the "earnest effort" which the militarists promise to put forth. In cases of this kind it is just as well to make surety doubly sure.

There comes to our desk an amazing poster, published by the American Guardian Association, 8 West 40th Street, New York. It is headed, in bold, black letters,

CAN'T YOU HEAR THEM?

Children of American Blood Are Calling for Our Help!

Then comes the statement that American children in the Philippines are in need—and danger! "Thousands of boys and girls of our own blood, little ones who honor our own flag, are desperately in need of our aid if they are to have a thread of a chance in this world." The few Americans in the Philippines, we are told, "have unselfishly and freely sought to carry this burden." But it is too great for them; they can't keep up with it. "It is a national obligation." *A national obligation* to care for *American* children! In heaven's name, who are these children? Who are their parents? Well, their parents are American soldiers and the native women whom they have debauched! The children are the unoffending offspring of the illicit unions between these two! At the present time these children number no less than 18,000. Most of them are neglected, many of them are out-and-out abandoned. To save the situation, the Guardian Association was organized four years ago by the six thousand American residents in the Islands, but they have found themselves altogether unable to handle the problem, and they are now turning to their fellow countrymen for aid. Their appeal states that

> The women who consorted with Americans, unfortunately, were usually of the tao, or peasant class. Drudging from morn to night, they are unable to earn more than a single Filipino peso, or 50 cents, a day. As a result, many of these abandoned or widowed women gave up the struggle to properly care for their little ones, took new partners, or, as often is the case, drifted into immorality. What follows? The boys are kicked out to become vagabonds or the cheapest of laborers.
>
> The girls are "loaned" to friends or relatives. And the latter step usually means their immoral exploitation when they reach maturity at from twelve to fourteen years, or even younger.

Indeed, these little girls are frequently sold to Chinese for the price of a good fat pig, and "are confined in

chicken coops when they refuse to accede to the demands of their masters." All under cover of the United States flag! It is a hideous thing, a "black spot," as the Brooklyn *Eagle* calls it. Yet it is nothing new or strange. This is militarism. This is army morals. This is war, and the glory of war, and the spiritual cleansing of war. This is empire, the "white man's burden," the advancement of civilization, the uplifting of benighted and barbaric peoples. And this isn't all of it! Add to the 18,000 children today, the thousands of children who have marched before them in a steady stream ever since 1900; add the new thousands now on the way and not yet counted; add the debauched women, the broken homes, the venereal disease, and all the rest. And then assess the price paid for the glory of our arms. War, militarism, the army, fighting, conquest, occupation—it's all a cesspool, too foul for contemplation. It is to the everlasting credit, however, of General Leonard Wood and the Guardian Association, that they have not attempted to cover up the situation, but exposed it to the light of day and challenged the American people to handle it.

Homer nodded! Even the best men can be at times ungenerous, unjust, malicious. There never was a more amiable man, for example, than the late Thomas R. Marshall. By his unfailing kindliness, his sincere humility, his utter unselfishness and high devotion, this man won distinction even in the Vice-Presidential office, and held firm throughout his public life the affection of the people. We believe that Mr. Marshall never consciously did an unkind deed, never deliberately spoke an unjust word. Yet, in his "Recollections," recently published in syndicated newspapers throughout the land, and now appearing in book form, he wrote the following of pacifists:

> Washington was seething between pacifism and war. A delegation of some ten thousand pacifists came to town. I was compelled to exercise my authority to prevent public speaking from the steps of the Capitol. I was as certain as I was of my own existence that it would lead to riot and tumult. Indeed, the only thing the pacifists ever did was for one of them to hit Henry Cabot Lodge. That man was a fair illustration of the pacifist, who always has been and always will be the most unreasonable of men, the greatest autocrat and the fellow who is quickest to resent with a blow any controversy about the opinions that he entertains. Of all hypocritical lovers of peace, the pacifist belongs in the thirty-third degree. I, myself, am for peace. I will go as far as any man can in that direction. No person in authority can offer anything for which I will not stand that seems to promote the peace of society, my country and the world. But I do not conceive that the peace of the world is to be promoted by putting up a sign to all the predatory peoples of the earth: "We will not fight! Come and take what you want!" Upon the contrary, I think the peace of the world is to be preserved by America being ready to defend her institutions, her citizens and her property, and by showing to the world, as she did in both the Spanish-American and the great war, that her fight was not a fight for territory or for personal aggrandizement.

This statement is, first of all, inaccurate. It was Senator Lodge who struck the pacifist, and not the pacifist who struck Senator Lodge. Secondly, the statement is the grossest kind of travesty on pacifism as a political and moral philosophy—no pacifist ever imagined in his most ecstatic moments of idealism that "the peace of the world is to be promoted by putting up (the) sign" suggested by Mr. Marshall. But these points of criticism are insignificant as compared with the sheer cruelty of this kind of attack—the wickedly unjust spirit of the misrepresentation and abuse here directed against some of the noblest of our American citizens. Such words might be understood and even forgiven if written in the heat of the madness which smote the nation in 1917. But no, they were written in cold blood six years later! How can one explain such a thing—except that Homer nods, the best men have their lapses?

The World Tomorrow is another excellent liberal journal that is trying strenuously at this time to increase its circulation. In the November issue it publishes a letter from an enthusiastic subscriber who writes:

> Enclosed you will find check . . . for seven subscriptions. I did not realize how easy it was to get subscriptions . . . until this, my first attempt.

If this is the case with *The World Tomorrow*, why not with UNITY also? Have you ever tried to get new subscribers for this paper which you like to read and in which you loyally believe? If you like it and believe in it, why not others? In any case, why not give these others a chance? We have a firm conviction that UNITY would sell itself easily to tens of thousands of people, if these people only knew about it. There is no way of reaching these people except through our subscribers. Why not help us, and thus prove the task is easy?

What is the Self?

Mr. Clarence Darrow once said:

> The reason that you buy a pencil from a legless man on the street, is not primarily because you feel compassion for his condition. It is primarily because you imagine yourself in his condition. You are not sorry so much for his real self as you are sorry for your own imagined self.

This was said in proof of a contention that we are all fundamentally selfish even in the reactions which we classify as altruistic—an ancient contention and one which seems to have abundant instance in its proof. The argument which would present such instances on every hand, would counter with examples of apparently pure altruism, maternal, paternal, filial, social, human. Examining these examples there would be uncovered many a root of personal pride, personal satisfaction, complacence, pleasure, duty, even self-indulgence—as we say. Even the altruism which is socialized, which spends itself not on dear individuals nor on strangers in distress, but goes out to all the world, at every contact, the argument would classify, we know, as "enlightened

self interest." And though it is impossible to prove that all altruism is at bottom selfishness, or that all social impulse is merely enlightened self-interest, still there are thronging cases in which the veil between seems thin indeed.

The veil is thin. Indeed, it is not there. And there is no argument if we examine into the true nature of that word "self."

What is the self? Jenkin Lloyd Jones would answer with the three words which he was wont to use in prayer: "The Human Being." The underlying substance, the single simple substance which is so complex in its manifestations. (And so illusory is this complexity of manifestation, that once, when someone had said that we are all more alike than we are different, a woman responded in surprise: "Oh, do you think so?") The fabric, in short, from which the whole human garment is cut. Naturally every one of its parts—hem, seam, sleeve, breadths, buttons, and even design—regards itself as an independent, living its own life. But the shears and the fabric can not even be aware of these strange and arbitrary distinctions, save as they serve the purpose of the smooth cloth in its manifestation as a garment. The whole problem of the day is to learn to parse the word "self" as a collective noun, as a singular instead of a plural. At least, until that far day when we understand the meaning of those elusive words "plural" and "multiple," and see them, as we would see a single candle set between two mirrors.

We have a measuring rod for every pursuit, project, opportunity: Will it advance the collective or the singular interpretation of the word "self"? The supreme blow to the collective interpretation of the word "self" is obviously war—the single garment rending itself, band attacking belt, and collar massacring cuff. There can be no collective use of the word in any form of exploitation, employer and employe imagining that their interests are at bottom diverse, banker and farmer, lender and borrower, buyer and seller, teacher and student, nation and nation, man and woman. And in all relationships, the value of any single act may be measured by its power to emphasize the word "self" as one instead of many. Dealings which seem neutral in the daily routine, if one looks at them closely, run dutifully into one or the other classification. Every time that we utter any form of "Me first," every time that we stress "Mine, mine," every time that we magnify self and diminish another, we have stressed the illusive plurality of self. (I think that to magnify another and to diminish self has not the same result of emphasizing separateness—since it serves to tip the terrible balance of the race a little nearer to the norm. It may do harm sometimes, but we would do well to risk it!) It is a magic test for every reaction, this inquiry into its tacit interpretation of the word "self." The supreme need of humanity is to "know the self as one." The Human Being.

Elie Faure has a wonderful phrase, in a discussion of form, in his History of Art. "Form—geometrical volumes penetrating one another, according to innumerable laws of attraction, *the remembrance of the common form from which all others sprang.*"

Not only The Human Being. The self appears to extend even farther. There is the eternal story of Lincoln and of the pig, pulled out of the mud not on account of its own discomfort, but on account of Lincoln's discomfort. Who shall say how far down into the animal world the word "self" penetrates? Again, there is that tender comment of Jenkin Lloyd Jones on the badger, running the road near Tower Hill: "Little brother—on the way." It is certain that St. Francis knew more than the stock-yards know.

And we go up the scale, too. The East makes a rich distinction between the self and the Self—the human self and the divine Self. To know the self and the Self as one—divine life and human life as one.

For this sort of realization there is a technique as definite as the technique of any other art. As a man thinks, so he is—but he must practice at the thinking. There is a simple exercise in the beginnings of the correct interpretation of the word "self": It is no more than the mental habit of self-identification with those with whom one is associated. Hearing with their ears, seeing with their eyes, following their reasoning. You may not agree, but you will comprehend. It is so that a story writer gathers material for his stories—utter self-identification with those, real or imaginary, of whom he is to write. This is not sentimentality. It is practice in understanding the nature of being. Fiction is more than fiction, business is more than business, club, home, nation are more than club, home and nation, for all are exercises in self-identification with the living. This is the recognition of the self. This is good will in action. Literally, this is the self, growing.

ZONA GALE.

Jottings

A full page advertisement in the New York *World* begins—

> Everybody's new customer was somebody's old customer.
> Every salesman's "prospect" is some other firm's customer.

If this isn't an open confession of the banditry that characterizes modern business, what is it?

It is a melancholy experience to read the announcement that Ida M. Tarbell has been selected as the official biographer of Judge Gary. There was a time when Miss Tarbell was the captain of her soul.

We read in a newspaper despatch that the American

Legion, before assigning its next convention to any city, "plans to give hotel owners assurance that legionnaires will not damage any hotel property." This is comforting, as we are told that the hotels in Kansas City, after the convention there, looked like the devastated regions in France.

We see that Mussolini has made treaties with Soviet Russia for joint action in certain spheres of mutual interest. These treaties were written over a year ago and are just now made public. Such action is going to make Mussolini a good deal less popular with his friends (*à la* Judge Gary) in this country, or the Soviets a good deal less unpopular. Which will it be?

Believers in spiritualistic mediums, especially those who believe in the famous medium, "Margery," should not fail to read Prof. Hudson Hoagland's article, "Science and the Medium," in the *Atlantic Monthly* for November. Such an exposè would seem to be final to any open mind.

We commend to our militarists, and to our big armament advocates generally, some of the "conclusions" to which Lord Grey comes in his memoirs, "Twenty-five Years." For example (volume II, page 279)—

> Every country (before the war) had been piling up armaments and perfecting preparations for war. The object in each case had been security. *The effect had been precisely the contrary of what was intended and desired.*

American Notes

(Editorial Correspondence)

I

There is a marked tendency in American life to rob death of its customary sombreness, by the undertakers' covering up the sad sides of life with cheerfulness. (One friend remarked—after glancing at the bill—undertakers can afford to look pleasant!) In former days, you could not tell the undertaker from the preacher, until one of them pronounced the benediction. At a recent convention of undertakers this change was brought out by the following statement: "We used to be Undertakers, Gloomy, Melancholic, Mournful, Cold and Aloof. Now we are Morticians, Hopeful, Live Wires, Cheerful Handshakers." As a matter of fact, the gloomy, high-hatted undertakers of the old school have given way to hopeful morticians, nattily attired and full of high-pressure cheerfulness. All of which is a "straw" showing a strong drift in American psychology.

The same cheerful spirit is at this season showing itself in the universities, as they open the new year. At our state university, for example, the 1500 new students, "freshmen," are being handed the following injunctions: "No 'fussing' or smoking on the Campus." "No standing on Denny Hall steps." "No appearance on the Campus without wearing a green cap." "Vigilance committee composed of more than 50 men armed with paddles will scour the Campus for offenders." Another "straw" showing the drift.

The cultivation of the cheerful spirit does not seem to conflict with a quick rebound toward seriousness. A German tourist once remarked to me that he was surprised by the ease with which an American audience could arise from the consideration of serious matters and indulge in fun and "horse-play." Americans seem also to have the same agility in going from the cheerful to the serious. At the same university, where "freshmen" are paddled who do not walk the "straight and narrow path," I attended the sixth annual banquet in honor of students from other lands. It was held in the gymnasium of the Y. M. C. A. of the university. The general secretary had spent several years in the Philippines and is one of a growing army of American youth who are getting the international outlook. This banquet was a "host and hostess" affair, since it was expected that they should go in to supper by twos and twos —one American citizen paired with one foreigner. Over 400 sat down to a chicken-dinner. Of these, between 80 and 90 were Japanese; over 80 Filipinos; between 30 and 40 Russians; about 50 Chinese; 4 Indians; and a sprinkling from Hawaii, Korea and Armenia. Of the foreign students at the banquet over 30 were girls.

There were three things about this banquet, that I would note. Such a social affair intimates one reason why America is an interesting land in which to live, namely the endless variety of its population. Cultures from the ends of the earth here meet. A second thing is the fact that at the present time the Y. M. C. A. is probably the most liberal, most spiritual and freest spot in American universities. This international banquet is a sample. I note, third, the remarks of the principal speaker of the occasion, Dr. Josef W. Hall, of the university, who described the scene around the tables as "epitomizing what is a correction of a separatist movement that started some 6000 years ago." He commended the wisdom of Confucius where he said, "To learn with personalities, is not that joy? . . . To mingle with friends from far places, that is pleasure. . . . If a man receive no attention and is not crushed, is he not superior?" He proceeded to show that race prejudice did not exist early in the white race. He traced its growth through Greek learning, whose pride created the term "barbarian," through Roman political imperialism, through Christianity whose perversion created a false pride which looked upon the "non-Christion world as having no rights at all," and finally upon the pride that grew out of the development of mechanical achievement in the Western world. "Race prejudice is based," he remarked, "on shifting sand . . . and the greatest problem now facing civilization is to bring together the two diverse sections of the world." Dr. Hall's views are probably representative of thoughtful America and will doubtless obtain in the end.

II

This brings to mind the Institute on Pacific Coast Relations, held in Honolulu, for three weeks of the month of July,—echoes of which are just beginning to be heard in pulpit and press, and on platforms. While the institute was made up of scarcely over a hundred delegates, those from America are being asked to tell about it. I have watched the press comments and heard a few addresses—one recently by Rev. J. E.

Crowther, whom I have often quoted before in these columns, because he "says something" when he speaks. That it should be held is noteworthy. It is probably only one of many more to follow. It was a meeting of intelligent men from many lands on the Pacific for the purpose of talking straight to each other of their differences and their common interests. There were no resolutions. There was reliance upon the plain truth to do the work of clearing away misunderstandings and of making a way for peace. Nine countries were represented in the conference. The delegates I have talked with and the press comments that I have read lead me to think that Americans are throughout the Institute on the defensive, that they even half believed the declaration of a brilliant Japanese that on practically every problem of the Pacific that arose America was found to be a stone wall to prevent its solution. The Americans were generally surprised and moved by the calibre and character of the men from China and Japan. Some of them found that arguments that would do for home consumption and political propaganda looked quite inadequate when uttered with men like Zumoto looking the speakers full in the face and ready at the close to ask questions based on correct historical knowledge and high ethical ideals. And when one of the Chinese intimated the "West was a part of the non-Christian world"—there was no come back. Nor, when one Chinese said that China might be compelled to close the "open door" and to place a padlock on the door with the inscription, "Closed by the Golden Rule," were Americans inclined to reply. Dr. Crowther said that the majority of the delegates came away believing that there were at least three dominant rights which every nation on the Pacific should enjoy. *Courtesy!* He said that the American delegates were hard put to to explain to the Japanese certain acts that were apparently discourteous. Further, every nation had the right to enjoy *sovereignty*. The Americans at the Institute saw that the fact of the presence of their merchants, missionaries and soldiers in the Orient concerned them. Every nation further had a right to *opportunity*. The people of Japan for example must have opportunity to expand, for nations do not chose to commit suicide. The most thoughtful Americans I think are coming to see that their treatment of the Orient is a challenge of Western Christianity.

Americans at the conference have not ceased to talk about the remarkable work of the Chinese Yen, "who is undertaking," as Chester Rowell is pointing out to his Rotarian and Kiwanis hearers, "to teach the Chinese, 300,000,000 of them, to read and write." In order to do this, he has invented a written language of 1,200 characters, so that the speech of the common man may be transferred to writing. By means of mass-methods, it is declared that the whole of China may be set to reading within a year. Such ambition and display of brains were a source of amazement to the Americans. They came away arguing, If this can be done in a year or so, what can't be done? A literate China, well, that is another matter. The West may yet admit that the pen is mightier than the sword—a sentiment that has appeared mostly in copy-books only.

III

I met an intelligent woman from Canada the other day. She is Beatrice Brigdon of Brandon, Manitoba, and is an organizer for a lecture bureau, which work takes her from Vancouver to Fort Williams, a distance of 2000 miles. I asked her how Canadians regarded their "minister" at Washington, and she replied, he was "considered as is 'lace upon the cuff.'" American investments in Canada are increasing very rapidly, according to Miss Brigdon. "English Canadians are not revolutionists, except those who are Scotch. Farmers' unions are growing. Canadian women are organizing industrially. They have recently had their first conference along social and economic lines." She thought that the sympathy of the people in general was for separation from Great Britain, partly because they were practically united with the United States, financially, in trade and socially. Financially Canada is controlled by Wall Street. She said that thousands were aroused over the spread of the "cadet" movement in the schools and were organizing to check it.

SYDNEY STRONG.

"Capacity to Pay"

Phrase-making has an irresistible attractiveness both to the maker and the hearer. International conferences have worked this side of the street to the limit; indeed, it is not too much to say that international phrases, coined from time to time, have indefinitely prolonged the infamous visit of the war system to this planet. Now this highly-prized process has been carried over to the economic field. Recently a new financial philosophy has been invented and put to emergency use, entitled—"capacity to pay." Of course this means a debtor's capacity to pay his creditor. At present this invention is in the sole monopolistic use of governments. But the contagion may spread. Debtors generally may be eager to expose themselves to the negative germ of "incapacity to pay."

It should be admitted at the outset that there are some conditions under which the expression "capacity to pay" seems to be relevant and really has some sense. If I go to the bank tomorrow and ask for a loan of fifty thousand dollars, my "capacity to pay" would seem to be a very important thing for the banker to inquire into before he lets go of the money. And again, if I owe a lot of money and don't pay it, go into bankruptcy, turn over all my assets, and my entire estate is thoroughly investigated, then my "capacity to pay" can be ascertained by establishing a ratio between all my assets and all my liabilities. This, however, is rather the capacity of my assets to pay than my own capacity to pay, for it takes no account of my future capacity to pay.

But in the international field it is not so. There is no such inquiry as "capacity to pay" when the money is borrowed. The United States would not have insulted France or Belgium or Italy by inquiring of their respective capacities to pay when the money was loaned, or when the goods were sold. This would be too much like sordid business relations and the "one hundred percenters" would have screeched like so many eagles. No, the new philosophy of "capacity to pay" looms on the horizon on the very day when the debt comes due. And, mark you, this capacity to pay is not determined as it is in common business affairs by a balance sheet

of assets and liabilities. Not at all. Some theoretical experts on each side figure out by the charted curves of the franc or the lire, or by the processes of inflation and deflation that have marked the past half century, or by a lot of bewildering statistics neatly prepared, what the new-fangled governmental "capacity to pay" of a reluctant debtor is. It never occurs to the debtor government to turn over to the United States any of its assets even located handily in this hemisphere; it apparently never occurs to our government to ask for assets to be turned over as security or in payment. That is not the way governments do business with one another. Only sordid business men and bankers do that! The French, having tried for something like four years to secure an utter cancellation of our debt, finally shifted gears and proceeded by degrees to offer an amount that sounds to the uninitiated ear like full payment, but which in fact is equivalent to about 25 cents on the dollar in real money, that is, in the kind of money they got from us.

Some strange factors enter into France's capacity to pay. For example, her present capacity to pay is manifestly reduced by the paramount necessity of waging a "righteous" war against the Riffians in Africa. The hundreds of millions of real dollars thus required would seem to take easy precedence over the payment of her honest debt to our country.

Where does this lead to? What becomes of honesty, common sense and honor, if this elastic, absurd, treacherous principle of "capacity to pay" is to be established in our economic life. If Mr. Mellon, for example, were to let the debtors of the Mellon National Bank retain their assets and compromise their indebtedness to the bank largely on the basis of their own figuring as to their "capacity to pay," the Mellon National Bank would be blotted out of existence within 24 hours. And the same would be true, of course, as to all other banking institutions.

Suppose, further, that the large issues of bonds sold to our citizens by the international bankers on behalf of the French government and French municipalities, when they come due from now on, are to be paid according to the "capacity" of France and her municipalities to pay. Judging by the offers of compromise lately made to the Calliaux Commission our government's judgment as to France's "capacity to pay" is not to exceed 40 cents on the dollar. The French "capacity to pay" being thus established, are these other bonds, sold by the international banking houses, also to be compromised for 40 cents on the dollar? If not, what becomes of this new great theory? Is it to be applied to dealings between governments and has it no application to debts owing by the same government to individuals and banking houses? If so, then France will pay the bankers' bonds 100 cents on the dollar, principal and interest, but will pay our people's bonds less than 50 cents on the dollar.

Take the case of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railroad. This road was taken charge of by our government in war time for war purposes and it is claimed the railroad was much the worse for the government's wear. During the war the government loaned to the St. Paul road, which was under its own control, 55 million dollars at 6 per cent interest, compounded. About a year ago the distressed St. Paul road tried to get relief from the 6 per cent rate of interest, but the government refused to change the written obligation or to grant any relief. The capacity of the St. Paul road to pay was then, or at least is now, well known of all men. It has become bankrupt. It is in the hands of receivers. Our Debt Commission has just settled the pre-Armistice debt owing by Belgium to the United States for about 1¾ per cent interest, payable annually for 62 years, whereupon the entire principal is to be cancelled. Will the United States government make the same settlement with its own citizens, the stockholders of the St. Paul railroad, that it made with the citizens of Belgium? Or will our government give the St. Paul road the 40 per cent compromise already offered France or even reduce the interest to 1 per cent for the next five years as just offered to France? If not, why not? If "capacity to pay" has any economic sense, here is a case to which it could easily be applied. By a "Belgian" or "French" settlement of this St. Paul debt the government could enable the railroad immediately to get out of receivers' hands with resulting boon to the thousands of stockholders and bondholders who are American citizens. But the government would consider this paternalistic, unscientific, socialistic or communistic. That is the same view it took when the farmers of the West, crying for help, were refused governmental aid. If it is paternalistic and unscientific for our government to give our farmers a hundred or two hundred million dollars, why is it not at least equally paternalistic and unsound to give hundreds of millions of dollars, yes, billions of dollars, to aliens?

The money owing to our government by France and Belgium is the people's money. The international bankers sold bonds on private loans to *some* of our people and these bonds are owned by *some* of our people. The French debt under discussion is owned by *all* of our people. Why is it that the money of *some* of our people is sacrosanct, whereas the money of *all* of the people is something like stage money, the melodramatics taking place on the international stage? Also, why is it that "some of the people" can get 8 per cent interest from foreign governments for their money while "all of the people" can get not to exceed 2 per cent or three per cent interest from the same governments? Is the people's money counterfeit? Or have we reached a stage of internationalism in which the money of the American people belongs in large part to the community chest of the world?

No wonder the French people laughed when they first saw our income tax lists and read names of our gullibly honest citizens who pay their tax debts. The French propose to levy no income taxes for our debt. Their program as disclosed here called for a total amount of money to be paid to all France's creditors very much less than the amount France is to collect from Germany alone. *This means that France is not willing to tax herself one dollar to pay us any part of our debt, principal or interest.* What kind of "capacity to pay" is this? A very large part of our government's income is derived from income taxes. We pay either the largest or the next to the largest income taxes of any country in the world. France has the same power to levy income taxes that the United States has. Our own "capacity to pay" would be seriously crippled if the power so to tax or the willingness so to tax our people were taken away. Now either France is unwilling to collect income taxes from her own citizens to pay her honest debts or her citizens are unable to pay income taxes and are bankrupt. No one in his right mind believes that either the French government or the body of French citizens are bankrupts. Therefore, if France has no "capacity to pay" based on income tax collections, it must clearly be because of her *unwilling-*

ness to enforce such taxation. That is to say, France is perfectly happy to have us enforce burdensome income taxes on our citizens and wholly unwilling to pursue the same policy with her own citizens. It seems that France has great "capacity to borrow" in war time and little or no "capacity to pay" in peace time. If this financial philosophy is to be adopted suppose it be widened so that our government will loan money to another government on that government's "capacity to borrow." That will fix the amount of the loan. Then the question of payment back will be solved by the capacity of that same government to pay. Both "capacity to borrow" and "capacity to pay" to be determined by the debtor nation. This would make an ideal quixotic foreign policy, and we surely ought thus to escape the epithet "Shylock."

The recognition and adoption of any such theory of payment by debtors as "capacity to pay" will threaten the whole structure of credit, honor and confidence in commercial relations. Under the guise of this specious principle the people's money is exposed to waste, gifts, manipulation and imperialistic uses. Sovereign promissory notes and bonds become "scraps of paper" indeed; and the savings of the people become the strategic plaything of political negotiators. If the American people ever have an opportunity to pass judgment on this thing they will hit it hard by merely applying President Coolidge's great domestic theory of common sense to international relations. S. O. LEVINSON.

Christian Leadership in American Government

(AN APPEAL TO THE CHURCHES)

The introduction to an article on Christian leadership in American government need contain no excuse for its existence, nor need it be burdened with quotations from eminent authorities in an effort to arouse the reader to a sense of the urgent need in America for such leadership. Yet vital as is the problem, and urgent as is the demand in our country for Christian leadership, I think that a treatment of the subject, either in articles or addresses, must, if such treatment is going to stimulate action, get away from the generalization of those who think that in Christian leadership we have a cure-all for the many maladies to which our government is ever susceptible. The treatment of such a theme should be specific—should give, not vague, indefinite theories, but, like "The Prince" by Machiavelli, definite, concrete facts and sane advice. With this end in view I think it advisable, in the following discussion, to limit ourselves to the answering of three questions: (1) Where, in our complex government, is Christian leadership most urgently needed? (2) Given this Christian leadership in this particular branch of our government, just what may it reasonably be expected to accomplish? (3) How is this Christian leadership to be recruited?

At the present rate of increase it is estimated that within another generation two-thirds of the population of America will be urban. This rapid growth in the size and number of our cities has resulted in much political experimentation in the field of municipal government, and, due to the increased influence which this growth in population has given to the cities in matters political, these experimentations, after having met the pragmatic test in the municipal laboratories, are frequently adopted by the state and national governments. So true is this that political scientists have coined the phrase: "As go the cities so goes the nation." In other words if a new policy in government is being accepted by the cities of America, then it is only a question of time before that policy will be adopted by the states and by the central government. Let us illustrate this tendency by reference to a current example.

Today we are living in a period of executivism. By this I mean that the popular emphasis in government—municipal, state and national—is upon the executive branches rather than either the judicial or the legislative. Over against this executive emphasis there has started, however, in the cities, a pronounced reaction. The rise of the so-called city manager form of municipal government, in so far as it places governmental powers in the hands of a city council, represents this interesting and wholesome reaction. It is to the significance of this reaction that I invite the reader's special attention, for the relationship between this new development in municipal government and our first question as to where in our complex government is Christian leadership most urgently needed is as important as it is close.

Ever since the days of Jackson the executive branches of our government have been slowly increasing their powers until today keen political observers do not hesitate to prophesy a dictatorship for America. The strength of the executive branches of our government is well illustrated by these facts: We have reduced the former annual sessions of our legislatures to biennial, and in most of the states we have placed a limitation ranging from thirty to ninety days on these biennial sessions; we have placed the veto power in the hands of our governors; we have imposed constitutional restrictions upon all appropriation bills; and we have (although we did so in an effort to champion the cause of social democracy) introduced the initiative and the referendum.

It is not difficult to cite the reasons for this curtailment of the powers formerly held by our legislators, and the assignment of these powers to executives. Our legislative bodies proved themselves to be incompetent, corrupt, and unfaithful to their trust. Those today who laud executivism do so largely because they feel that it affords the speed of direct action, freedom from the blunderings of large unwieldy and ignorant legislative bodies, and an opportunity to hold the mayor, governor or president to strict personal responsibility for inefficiency or dishonesty in the administration of the public's business. But as the cities were the first units to champion executivism for its virtues so they are the first to repudiate it for its evils. What are these evils?

We find them most nefariously presented in our large municipalities, for it is the large city with its many conflicting social forces that places the greatest strain upon a given governmental policy. (If democracy can be made to function in our large urban units we need have no fear for its future.) The evils of a powerful city executive, a mayor, are found in the development of an administrative oligarchy which, like

a great octopus, spreads its domination in all directions. It is true that the righteous mayor can use his vast powers for the accomplishment of much good, but it is also true that executivism carries with it no guaranteed preventive against those same powers passing into the hands of an unscrupulous opportunist, and when that happens, as it frequently does, there quickly develops an all but impregnable political machine with its henchmen in every public office, a machine that does not hesitate to practice open defiance of election laws (See the articles on "Politics: Behind the Scenes" by Imogen B. Oakley in the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, also similar data collected by the Department of Political Science, University of Chicago), and with an elaborate system of propaganda, often supported by public funds, which feeds the ignorant, bewildered public an incessant stream of lies.

The lengthy bills of rights introduced in the early state constitutions of America were placed there to protect the citizens from these aggressive, corrupt acts of officialdom in government, from the government becoming dictatorial. The modern evils of executivism are identically these same evils which our forefathers feared. It is encouraging, therefore, that the citizens of our municipalities, having experienced these evils for themselves, are fleeing, as did the Revolutionary fathers, to the safety of parliamentary bodies. Cleveland, for example, the largest American city to introduce the city manager form of government, in introducing that form has sought to place in the former office of mayor a skilled, non-political technician, appointed by the council, and has invested the real powers of the city's government in the hands of its new legislative council of twenty-five members.

For these reasons, therefore, namely, that executivism is freighted with the evils of a dictatorship and that our governmental experimental stations (the cities) tell us that the political barometer of America indicates an early return to a confidential placement of the responsibility for government in legislative bodies, which is in direct accord with the political operations of the fathers of the Revolutionary period (Montesquieu and his theoretically accepted tri-power form of government to the contrary notwithstanding)—for these reasons I maintain that the place in our complex government where Christian leadership is most urgently needed is in city councils, state legislatures, and our national Congress. To place men of sterling Christian character and astute political judgment in these, the legislative branches of our government is to act with foresight toward the establishment in America of a social order founded on the ethical teachings of Jesus. Let us now turn to our second question: Given this Christian leadership in this particular branch of our government (the legislative), just what may it reasonably be expected to accomplish?

It is a mistake (and one, I am sorry to say, often made) to look upon the duties of a legislative body as composed primarily with the passing of new laws and ordinances. Laws, even constitutional amendments, amount to nothing in a democracy unless they represent the conviction of the majority of that group in the interest of which they were passed. Note, for example, the fourteenth amendment to our own constitution, and how the so-called liberty and property clauses have been evaded so far as negro political rights in the South are concerned (and the South has some justification for these evasions), but used by big business in the North as a weapon with which to fight social legislation. Yes, laws and ordinances, unless the public is educated to a desire for the values which those laws and ordinances seek to foster, are more than worthless. They are detrimental in that they breed disrespect for government. But the passage of legislation is not the paramount duty of parliamentary bodies. Their chief task is that of formulating policies, and of advising the people whom they represent on matters pertaining to their common welfare. It is correct to say that a congressman or an alderman is under obligation to vote as the majority in his constituency wish him to vote, but what man is in a better position to mold the opinion of that majority than is that congressman or that alderman? Legislators are also instructors in the art of good government. To them belongs the double task of first converting the majority of their constituents to the acceptance of their political philosophy, and then, having won that acceptance, the legalizing of the new policy through the passage of adequate legislation. It is only when the politician in Congress, in the state legislature, and in the city council nobly performs the joint activities of this double role that he ceases to be a mere holder of a public office and becomes a true statesman. Theoretically Congress, like its prototype the British Parliament, is a great debating society (and the same is true of state legislatures and city councils) to which the forty-eight states send their ablest citizens. These representatives, theoretically, are the formulators, the inventors of those aspirations and beliefs which the majority of the citizens of each state desire to see brought into concrete form by the passage of laws. Today Congress is laughed at; today the press of the nation editorially applauds when a reserve officer in the executive branch of our national government vociferously ridicules the parliamentary methods of our Senate; today the nation falters on the threshold of a new day in social welfare, falters because our legislators, city, state and national, are not big enough men to perform the first part of their two-fold task—converting their constituents to their political gospel.

What may Christian leadership in the legislative branches of our government reasonably be expected to accomplish? Just this: To supply that spiritual dynamic, that missionary sense of the supreme worth of the desired objective in order that political evangelism may precede legislation; in order that the majority in our nation may have the benefit of politicians who are leaders, Christian leaders, teaching, exhorting, persuading their constituents to take those progressive steps which lead to the greatest good for the greatest number—to furnish this type of politician as over against that decadent legislator who is content to permit the demos to stumble, blunderingly along, untaught, unguided, so long as the rabble is sufficiently unorganized in purpose not to jeopardize his snug and comfortable public seat of inactivity. Christian leadership in our legislative branches would safeguard democracy, would accomplish many mechanical changes in our government, such as eliminating death bed repentance legislation, would foster the great cause of internationalism, and would give the aid of Christian ethics toward the solution of the race problem, the neo-Malthusian problem, the conservation problem, and the war problem. No Hebrew prophet in the days when Israel was fighting for national independence was ever called to solve questions of so great a magnitude.

It is a mistake to think that the questions placed in the hands of our politicians pertain merely to the awarding of a little harbor port, or the adjustment of a civil war pension. The very destiny of our nation rests upon the integrity and the foresight of our men in public office. Upon their shoulders rests the responsibility for solving these many, exceedingly difficult and perplexing questions to which I have just referred, and such questions can only be successfully answered when the church lends its support to that government under whose protection it has enjoyed complete freedom and has prospered; lends its support not by getting into politics itself as an organization (we do not want that) but by encouraging its noble, righteous, young Christian men and women to enter into political careers.

That wonderful statesman, Lord Bryce, in a lecture delivered in London during the war, said:

> Is not our task that of so furnishing and preparing the minds of men and of nations that they will accept that nobler and loftier morality in which co-operation for high ends displaces the mere material struggle for gain and for power?

To which I answer, Yes, but how unless we have in our public offices men as grand in Christian nobility and as wise in governmental management as was this distinguished Englishman?

> "The great tasks of modern democracy," writes that learned Chicago political scientist, Dr. Charles E. Merriam, "are the organization of world relations upon a modern rather than a caveman basis, and the readjustment of the conflicting claims of social classes within states.

But again I ask, How are these ends to be accomplished apart from sterling Christian leadership in American government?

It is to these staggering tasks in reference to the maintenance of democracy, and in reference to the great problems of race, of war, and of internationalism as the next unit of government—it is in the interest of the solution of such tasks as these that I call upon the churches to give us Christian volunteers, for only with intelligent Christian leadership can be solve these problems.

Let us now turn to a consideration of our third and final question: How is this Christian leadership to be recruited?

There are a number of methods which might be suggested, but I wish in this article to restrict myself to one—the social gospel as preached from the pulpits of our modern churches. It is largely through missionary sermons that there is recruited each year a large number of young men and women who deem it a blessing to be permitted, in the face of social isolation and financial privation, to carry the teachings of Jesus to foreign shores. These young men and women are not afraid of hard work; they are willing to invest many years in collegiate preparation for their chosen profession. Neither are they afraid that sordid conditions and contact with low and corrupt characters will damage their souls. Their challenge is one to serve their God, and the more difficult the task the greater their desire to sacrifice all toward its successful accomplishment. If the church is justified in recruiting youth for these missionary endeavors (and few would dispute such an assertion), why is it not justified in recruiting young men and women for Christian leadership in American government? And such recruiting will start just as soon as the modern minister makes his social gospel practical by exhorting the young men and women of his congregation who wish to undertake a great Christian task to prepare themselves for political careers. Mere exhortation by itself will not, however, in the end, be enough. The minister must himself become sufficiently conversant with the leading political and economic problems of our day to be able to present these problems from his pulpit.

As a means toward acquiring such a knowledge I know of no better method, in cases where graduate work in political science at a leading university is impractical, than for the minister to become a member of the following excellent organizations: the American Academy of Political and Social Science, the Academy of Political Science in New York, the American Political Science Association, and the National Municipal League. Their voluminous publications and their many conferences and conventions will supply him with a vast amount of authentic information. Again, after the youths of our churches are exhorted to serve God by giving to America intelligent Christian leadership, the minister must have ready an answer to the first question which the new convert will ask: How do I start?

It is regrettable that a profession as important as that of government should not have recognized training schools which fit the student for political office, and which have, in the mind of the public, sufficient confidence and prestige so that the possessor of a degree from these institutions would gain immediate and popular approval in all primaries. Until such professional training schools are established (they would be for politicians what graduate medical schools are for physicians, law schools for attorneys, and divinity schools for clergymen) the modern minister of the social gospel seeking recruits for Christian leadership in American government can do no better than to urge that the youthful volunteer finish his college, majoring in political science, and take not less than one year of graduate work in that and cognate fields. With this training the recruit will be able to see how best to approach his desired goal through other than direct channels—channels such as, for example, journalism, a professorship in political science, law, business, et cetera. And let not the minister be surprised if his first convert decides, after completing his training, that the ministry itself offers one of the best stepping stones to political office, for the modern minister of the social gospel, when adequately trained in the fields of political science and economics, makes an ideal Christian leader in the legislative branches of our government.

In conclusion I wish to say for emphasis, that (1) the legislative branches of our government, city, state and national, offer the best place for Christian leadership; that (2) those holding such leadership in our legislative bodies will be strategically situated for the accomplishment of great forward moves toward the solution of such intricate political, economic and social problems as those pertaining to internationalism, war, race and democracy; and that (3) this Christian leadership can best be recruited through the preaching of the social gospel by ministers well versed in the theories and the operations of modern democracies.

Edward Arthur Rockwood.

THE STUDY TABLE

A Brief Study of a Subtle Mind

Everyone who reads thoughtful books knows something of Dean Inge of St. Paul's, London. A recent re-publication of his "Personal Idealism and Mysticism" (Longmans, Green & Co.), consisting of six lectures delivered in New York in 1906, affords a striking view, not only of a continually recurring subject of human experience, namely Mysticism, but also of the working of a fascinating, original and rather perplexing type of mind. He seems to be fond of handling paradoxes. At any rate his mind contains queerly dissimilar ideas in amiable companionship together. Besides many strikingly suggestive expressions of his own which tempt the reader to mark the pages, he presents a wide acquaintanceship with writers of various ages and tongues and shades of religion, from whom he cites notable and often illuminating passages.

The fact is, that in less than two hundred pages, Dean Inge undertakes to set forth something of the innermost interpretation of that form of experimental religion, known as "Mysticism," that is, man's actual consciousness of the presence of God as the very light of his life. Seeing what the word Mysticism carries to the minds of many straightforward thinkers (for example, the name of Dr. Charles W. Eliot occurs at once) I could have wished that the Dean had used the simplest form of approach and the plainest words, and had tried to tell us just what the vital experience of the "life of God in the soul of man" means, what it does for him, and what it enables him to be and to do. It is doubtless a mighty development of the human mind, and it ought not to remain among the difficult and occult things—a secret for the few—but to prove itself the most precious treasure of our common heritage. Rather unfortunately, Dr. Inge has chosen the historical and distinctly dogmatic way of approach. Easy and delightful traveling as this is to him, I suspect that his choice of it will cost him most of the readers whom he might otherwise have served as a most helpful guide.

It comes to pass that this little book wonderfully illustrates the bewilderment of thought which the typical modern churchman produces in trying to pour the new wine of his free thought into the quaint formulas of the old orthodox bottles. The ecclesiastic must continue by all means to repeat and justify his creeds. Dean Inge carries out this two-fold process with rare ingenuity. Let me express what I mean as briefly as possible in several particulars.

A. As to the idea of God, I find myself in an unusual harmony with Dr. Inge's position. He knows profoundly well the highest thought of the living God, One in all the manifoldness, God of the many names—Might, Beauty, Wisdom, Will, Light, Life, Love—all that the purest men and women have ever mirrored forth. It is reality and no mere dream; for it is that in which we live. It is no sham God, childish and impotent, a Monarch on a throne, or a God in the making; it is the Eeternal and Infinite without which man's mind can never be satisfied. It is the God of the children and the thinker. Why now must the churchman in Dr. Inge insist upon forcing the name of the Trinity, a sect name, and no universal name at all—upon this great faith in God? But, let it pass.

B. I have tried all my life to learn what Christians mean by the "Trinity." Dr. Inge appears to make great account of this sacred word. But I fail to get any light on its meaning. Under his skillful hand it yields no new richness of the meaning of deity. He warns us at once not to suppose that the key-word, "person," in the creeds means anything that people of the English speech associate with its use! He remarks upon the danger of the popular evangelicalism falling over into tritheism, for which he has no more use than a Moslem; and he quotes approvingly a fine passage from Prof. W. Wallace, pp. 90-92, which closes with the words: "God, self and neighbor form an indissoluble Trinity." Why the capital T? Why should the churchman wish readers to think that he is an "orthodox" upholder of something that his forbears at Nicaea were ready to tear their opponents to pieces for doubting? What is there in this thing, *Trinity,* either to propound or to deny? Why hold up a Shibboleth to divide the faithful?

C. About "Our Lord Jesus Christ." I see a temporary "symbolic" use in thinking of a single spiritual hero as representing the love of God incarnate in a man. No one, however, sees more clearly than Dean Inge that symbols wear smooth and fade out. What does he mean by this peculiar identification of the Eternal Christ idea in the deity with the life of Jesus of Nazareth? He does not mean, surely, that Jesus, a Jew, was at the same time the fulness of the Godhead; or even that He was perfect and sinless except in that general sense in which it is said of any other man, for example, his friend Nathanael, that he was "without guile." He cannot mean that Jesus' teaching was infallible or even altogether humane. Witness what Jesus doubtless thought of the "angry God" and the future of the wicked, in following which the church has committed the most fatal crimes against our common humanity. Thus men lightly ring the changes on the name of their symbolic hero—the last survival of the mighty edifice of forgotten dogma.

Why should they try to distinguish themselves from the fellowship of the church invisible? Dean Inge's own attitude is that of complete fellowship in the simple name of Goodness; and his idea of Incarnation seems to be no less comprehensive than the spiritual possibilities of mankind and the purpose of the Eternal! Himself a free-thinker, he puts on the literary clothing that would have fitted the late Mr. Moody.

I speak strongly on this point in the interest of the values which Dean Inge sets highest of all, and for which he quotes the most authoritative voices. I believe that this fog of hopeless bewilderment which has been made to encompass the simple person of Jesus, and to differentiate him from all mankind—from every other hero, or teacher, or lover of men—has come to be one of the most fatal stumbling blocks against the prosecution of the good life, as measured by Jesus' own story of the Good Samaritan. Men say at last: "One man only, raised above human nature, ever could do what Christ bade," and they dismiss the Golden Rule from the list of their responsibilities. Least of all do they catch anything of his secret of mystic religion, wherein Jesus rested His will in the infinite Good Will of the Universe. Why will not Dean Inge, who knows full well how large is the brotherhood of those who hold dear the secret of the Good Will, help to clear away the last dogmatic difficulties which entangle the

feet of men who desire to walk together in the freedom of the Spirit?

D. There was once a rather terrible doctrine of "Sin." It was *lese majesté,* carried to the *nth* power, and it called for an infinite satisfaction or atonement. Thus came the dogmas of the Trinity, and an Eternal Christ, and the death of an infinite being to make atonement before men and angels. Thus it became a test of sound orthodoxy to talk with bated breath of the "sinfulness of sin."

In Dean Inge's interesting chapter about sin, I can discover no marks of evangelical orthodoxy. Indeed. Except for the use of remnants of the ancient phraseology, in which he pays his respects to his churchmanship, he writes with a pretty clear sense of the immense light which the thought of evolution casts upon the subject of evil. Is not "evil" the condition and the cost of a world where creatures grow, where babies are born and nursed, where things big and little and colors and shadows and contrasts are shown, where all spiritual differences between good will and ill will appear, as men climb out of the dust to their fulfillment as sons of God? Sin, then, is the old animal in us, reluctant to have us enter the realm of our ideals as men. We "overcome evil with good"—the reluctance of the beast by the growth of the man. We need more light and trust and courage. We do not help the wrong-doers by calling them wicked, or by forcing them to confess their sins; they need rather to see the truth,—that they are dull, feeble, immature and egotistic, whereas the good life is beautiful.

Am I too impatient with the churchman's part in this little book? The English-speaking world has just been stirred with the astounding ignorance and medievalism coming to light in a little town in Tennessee. There is a deal of this denseness in millions of minds, almost ready in spots to break out in flames of bigotry and persecution. This is not the fault of the people. No one has ever shown them a better way. But there are a host of preachers in the land who are doing just what the Dean of St. Paul has done. Knowing better, they nevertheless go on speaking a language in religion which no longer rings true. They explain away or evade grand duties, while they still teach people to repeat the shibboleths. Do they not come at last to lose the way for themselves, as for others, to the eternal fountains of the living waters of life?

Let me not close without a word of assurance of the high values in Dr. Inge's book. It well repays reading—at least for those who are not mystified or repelled by its ecclesiastical dialect.

CHARLES F. DOLE.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

Los Gatos, Calif., October 25, 1925.

To Hon. Friend W. Richardson,
Sacramento, California.

Dear Sir:—

A momentous decision in the moral history of California has been placed before you in pardoning Charlotte Anita Whitney or sending her to San Quentin. Since the United States Supreme Court is not to review the appeal in the Whitney Case on technical grounds, liberal minded people are turning to you to interpret the moral feeling of California of today and tomorrow.

Miss Whitney is not alone a product of California's culture and grace, a daughter of a former Supreme Court justice, but she is the conscience of California.

A minister of Sacramento once told me that because Miss Whitney was a college graduate and so well informed she should have known better than to associate herself with Communists and the I. W. W. Miss Whitney is part of that liberal movement in social service in this state inspired by the investigation of the late Carleton Parker. The casual labor situation in this state a dozen years ago was a blot on the face of humanity. The Wheatland Riots brought the attention of California to this condition. The reports of the Immigration and Housing Commission reveal the terrible state of the casual agricultural lumber and dock workers at that time.

These conditions so stirred sensitive people like Miss Whitney that a rising tide of conscience was turning in favor of collective bargaining and labor organization for the unskilled workers. It was a California and Pacific States problem. Miss Whitney followed the movement into labor organization as a means of rendering greatest service.

The so-called "Oriental Syndicalist" law of 1919 was rushed through the legislature on an unprecedented wave of hysteria. It was backed by sinister forces in this state opposed to all collective bargaining, especially among the unskilled. (The unskilled are always our weaker brothers.)

The law of conscience did not permit Miss Whitney to desert the ideal of organization as a means of betterment. Though a host of ministers, lawyers, college and public school educators, club women and the press generally were silenced by this law, conscience is still at work among the liberal minded of California. Mention of the name of Miss Whitney proved a bombshell in more than one liberal gathering. Those who persisted were read out of liberal groups. Liberalism seemed to be dead.

Now with this situation brought on by design, for the most part by interested forces, you are to judge of the popular feeling. I sympathize with you in having this decision forced upon you. Certainly the feeling is against Miss Whitney today. If you do not know her I suggest that you meet her for you will meet the gentlest woman in California. She is not the haggish cartoon radical pictured in a late issue of a San Francisco paper. People expect her to be fierce. Picture to match will deceive even the wise.

Today is the darkest hour in the moral history of this state if you do the will of the people. Tomorrow and conscience is with Miss Whitney. California will turn to conscience when this dread and fear are gone and then your name will be mentioned with those who were right but for a single day. The tide will turn. Then every blessed liberal who is now so silent before you will turn and rend you for doing the popular will. It is a case of condemned if you do and condemned if you don't.

The one hundred or more members of the I. W. W. in San Quentin for whom Miss Whitney has this deep concern are equally innocent with her of any overt crime. In fact, they have not even been accused of any other crime than belonging to the organization, the only one designed for casual laborers. This organization has repudiated acts of violence committed by homeless, familyless, wifeless and childless men. As Carleton Parker has said of Casual Labor in California, these facts, peculiar to the seasonal worker, make a problem not easily understood and settled by skilled labor.

Father John Ryan of the Catholic University at Washington never ceases to enlighten all who will hear—that is—that none of the men and women jailed under the syndicalist laws of this state and other states are guilty of any overt act. They are one and all there for opinion's sake.

Liberals have deserted you for the most part Governor Richardson but the conscience of California is with Miss Whitney and the stand she is taking for bettering the weakest of our working brothers.

The silenced ranks of ministers and teachers, professional and cultured people are not silent in their hearts. They are (with notable exceptions) washing their hands in the end to let history write your name as one who did a deed against the conscience of our fair state of California.

ARTHUR B. HEEB.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

AN IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT TO CHICAGO READERS

On November 27th, our Editor, John Haynes Holmes, will address the Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday Morning Forum, on *Voltaire and Bernard Shaw: a Biographical Parallelism.*

December 4th, another member of our Editorial Board, Dr. Frederick Starr, now of Seattle, Washington, will speak on *The Chinese Situation.*

Time: 10:30. Place: Abraham Lincoln Centre. Admission fifty cents.

INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

Monthly News Sheet

Austria.—The Gaming Conference. From September 4-10 the Austrian F.o.R. held the long-planned conference for South-Eastern Europe, which had been successfully organized in the face of many difficulties by Beatrice B. Hoysted. The participants, not all of whom could attend throughout, were: ten Austrians, a Bulgarian, a Canadian living in Poland, a Czech, an Englishwoman, a German from Bohemia, a Hungarian, two Italians, an Irishwoman, a Jew, two Russians, a Ukrainian, two Yugo-Slavs and four citizens of the United States. The conference discussed the Minority question, refusal of military service and the relation of science to the general principles of the Fellowship. There was a marked atmosphere of reality, especially in the discussions on the Christian basis and the refusal to serve. Those who began the discussion in an academic and theoretical manner found themselves yielding to the general intense conviction, and every meeting was marked by sincerity and affection. The setting in the old fourteenth-century monastery, now turned into a Boys' Home and swarming with young life, was admirable. The director, who is animated by devotion to his boys, proved to be in absolute sympathy with our ideas. On the last day some of the conference members addressed the boys. There was also a speech on what Austria is doing for her neglected and illegitimate children. Children from Holland and Berlin have been received in this Home, where internationalism is taken for granted, and it is hoped to have English children in the near future.

* * *

France.—The 24th Universal Peace Congress organized by the International Peace Bureau of Geneva (formerly at Berne) took place in Paris from September 1-6. The patronage of the French Government which is at present conducting a war, was not conducive to freedom of atmosphere, and the non-appearance of M. Herriot at the official opening was felt to be a slight to Herr Loebe, president of the Reichstag. But after regrets at the incident had been expressed by the French, Herr Loebe made a most impressive speech and was enthusiastically applauded. Among the most prominent speakers were J. H. Hudson, M. P., Marc Sangnier, Walter Ayles, well-known member of the British F. o. R., and Georges Pioch. The later two advocated the radical C.O. position. They created great interest, but the Congress rejected by 194 votes to 144 a motion declaring that C.O.'s should be recognized by their Governments as acting within their rights. The opposition to this motion came from M. Ferdinand Buisson, who is president of the French League of the Rights of Man. His argument was that so long as men lived in communities the individual could not be liberated from all duties. Radical opinions refuting the "duty" to kill (or to be killed, for that mater) could not be expressed as fully as is desirable, but good work was achieved in this respect by the youth section. As in Luxembourg there was an urgent demand for European free trade.

* * *

Germany.—An interesting controversy has recently taken place between Pater Stratmann, author of the book, "World Church, World Peace," and leader of the Peace Society of German Catholics, and Pater Muckermann, a well-known popular speaker. Stratmann had expressed fairly radical opinions on modern war, passive resistance and possible refusal to serve from religious motives and he carried the day in the debates which were eagerly followed by the whole German Catholic press. The Peace Society of German Catholics held a very successful meeting in Beuron (Black Forest) from August 18-22. The importance of winning the priests for pacifist education was emphasized and Pater Stratmann spoke on conscientious objection.

The Polish Question was courageously tackled by some members of the Society of Friends who recently organized a conference for Poles and Germans in the Free City of Danzig. Heinrich Becker, director of the Quaker publishing house in Berlin, who spoke on international friendship, began his address with the following words: "We must grant that genuine friendship between men of different nationalities is rare, and between groups is still more rare; nevertheless, we hold the unshaken conviction that it is possible to come to a favorable international understanding, with a full recognition of the just and rational necessities of the different peoples. . . . International law, which has been developing for a long time, requires still a long period before it can come to the same degree of reliability as that of the civil and criminal codes in civilized countries. Such a development will be impossible unless a number of persons in the different States develop something of an international conscience, and work constantly and unselfishly in their respective countries to fulfill the requirements of this conscience."

* * *

Great Britain.—Naval Armaments. On July 29 Captain Wedgwood Benn, Liberal M. P., made a speech in the House of Commons in connection with the Navy Debates. It has now been printed in pamphlet form by the National Council for Prevention of War, under the title "The Testament of the Fallen and the Cruisers of the Government." We must content ourselves here with a few extracts from this brilliant and courageous argument. Captain Wedgwood Benn states that employment created by armaments is counterbalanced by unemployment arising out of overtaxation and that other countries will soon follow in "employing" their workers for the same unproductive purposes. He further states "One of the main reasons that I oppose on financial grounds these large fighting service expenditures is because, if they are granted, then there will not be the money for rendering life less intolerable to the people in the industrial conditions in which they find themselves today. . . . The Government have to decide whether they are going to secure the safety of our country by competitive naval building or by disarmament by agreement. . . We were taught in school, and children are taught in school today, that war is valour, brilliant victories, new markets and the rest. We know all that to be a lie. We know that war means maimings, mutilations, widowhood, starvation. . . . . The Government can put their program through, and wring the taxation from the industries of this country. They have an enormous majority. They can invent and manufacture the engines of war, but they may find, when the time comes, that there is no cannon-fodder. They may find that for all their programs and all their power their policy will be defeated by the common people who will say 'No'."

This gallant effort cannot be blotted out even by the launching of new cruisers. Dame Caroline Bridgeman, wife of the

---

AN APPEAL

Editor of UNITY:

May I bespeak your pity for the abandoned children of Americans in the Philippines whose fathers have died, or gone away, and left them behind, and whose native born mothers are unable to rear them as Americans? Many of these children are freckled and light haired and largely American in type and character, but their lot is bitter. No race in the Islands is so friendless, so forgotten. At present the small and heavily burdened American group in the Philippines through a society known as the American Guardian Association, is doing what it can in their behalf, but the responsibility is altogether beyond its means and possibilities. Hence, this appeal.

The Association now cares for approximately 135 girls and 15 boys through placing them in schools and homes established by the Catholic and Protestant churches of the Philippines and the agricultural schools of the Islands, the cost to the Association being $16.00 per month for each girl and $12.00 for each boy. This sum includes food, clothing, lodging and education. Unfortunately, however, out of 18,000 such children of mixed blood, fully 2,500 are sadly in need of relief and care, and it is impossible for the Association to assume further responsibilities with its present inadequate resources.

The American Guardian Association therefore, asks the citizens of the United States to subscribe to and create an Endowment Fund of $2,000,000 to be invested in this country, but the income from it to be used for the care and relief of those children most direly in need.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know at the outset that we want your valued co-operation including your endorsement and as far as possible, your good offices in interesting others to assist this essential undertaking for the relief of forsaken little children.

W. CAMERON FORBES,
General Chairman.

American Guardian Association, 8 W. 40th St., New York City

First Lord of the Admiralty, recently launched Britain's newest battleship, the Nelson. It is unofficially said that the Nelson is the most powerful thing afloat in any navy and her cost is estimated between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000. Both Mr. Bridgeman and his wife made speeches expressing the hope that the Nelson and her sister-ship, the Rodney, which will shortly be launched, would not be considered a menace but rather a guardian of peace, a hope which will hardly be shared even by the most optimistic of pacifists.

The Peace Week of Youth was celebrated from September 13-19 by a number of English Youth organizations, including the Youth Section of the No More War Movement, the Young Friends (Quakers), the Guild of Citizens of Tomorrow, the Guild of Youth of the Independent Labor Party and a great many other bodies. In London and in twenty important provincial centers meetings, demonstrations and processions have taken place and young people have declared their determined opposition to war and militarism and their intention of working for an internationalism among youth which shall make war forever impossible.

The resolution adopted at the Peace Week of Youth Meetings was as follows: "We, in this Youth Demonstration, believe that creative peace can be established only by the vigorous effort of every individual. Because of our youth the responsibility of destroying the military spirit is ours. We are the homemakers, the teachers and the leaders of tomorrow. The world s future lies in our keeping. We are, therefor, determined to do all in our power to bring about a warfree world, based, not on force and greed, but on co-operation and love. Our call goes out to the youth of all nations."

In order to carry out more effectively the work for peace, English Youth Organizations are joining together in the British Federation of Youth which will co-operate with similar groups throughout the world in the establishment of a World Federation of Youth for Peace. For further information write to Margaret Porteous, 421 Sentinel House, Southampton Row, London, W. C. 1.

* * *

Roumania.—In spite of the reactionary Government in Roumania an "Independent Union of Students" has recently been formed in Bucarest in opposition to the existing Student bodies which have strong Facist and anti-Semitic tendencies. A manifesto published by the Union this summer proclaims the ideals of peace and democracy and even has a leaning toward Marxian Socialism. It was well received by the press and in intellectual circles.

* * *

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren St., CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!

Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.

Insist on

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM DOMESTIC COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

NOVEMBER

With its brisk, wintry touches, suggests that your furs be at once conditioned for their season of heavy usage. Delicate, skilled and dependable are the processes by which we brush, cleanse, sanitize and prolong the life of the fur garments you entrust us with.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0281 : : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS MAIN OFFICE AND WORK
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY